

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are present in this application. Claims 1, 8, 18, and 20-22 are independent. In this response, no claims have been canceled, no claims have been added, and claims 1, 8, 18, and 20-22 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Substance of Interview

Applicants appreciate that the Examiner has conducted an interview with the Applicants' representative. An agreement with respect to the claims was reached. The Examiner agreed that the feature (now claimed) "wherein the jamming signal is a received signal different from the received video signal, the jamming signal being generated from a device different from the device that has transmitted said video signal, and the jamming signal is a signal from which no recognition information signal is detected, and wherein the recognition information signal is a signal that is used for enabling connection to a specific destination" (*i.e.*, as recited in independent claim 1) overcomes the current rejection of record.

Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) / Claim Rejection - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-2 and 18-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Gangitano (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,452). Claims 3-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gangitano. Claims 8-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Gangitano in view of Ohgami et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120742). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Argument: Features of claims 1, 8, 18, and 20-22 not disclosed by cited prior art

While Applicants maintain that the cited prior art fails to disclose the claimed invention of independent claims (*i.e.*, cited prior art fails to disclose the claimed jamming signal), Applicants have amended the claimed invention in order to move prosecution forward.

Independent claims 1, 8, 18, and 20-22 have been amended to include additional limitations. More specifically, independent claim 1 as amended recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the jamming signal is a received signal different from the received video signal, the jamming signal

being generated from a device different from the device that has transmitted said video signal, and the jamming signal is a signal from which no recognition information signal is detected, and wherein the recognition information signal is a signal that is used for enabling connection to a specific destination.”

The cited prior art fails to disclose that 1) the jamming signal is a received signal different from the received video signal, 2) the jamming signal being generated from a device different from the device that has transmitted said video signal, and 3) the jamming signal is a signal from which no recognition information signal is detected (where the recognition information signal is a signal that is used for enabling connection to a specific destination).

During an Interview with the Examiner, the Examiner agreed that the cited prior art fails to disclose the amended claimed feature (*i.e.*, “wherein the jamming signal is a received signal different from the received video signal, the jamming signal being generated from a device different from the device that has transmitted said video signal, and the jamming signal is a signal from which no recognition information signal is detected, and wherein the recognition information signal is a signal that is used for enabling connection to a specific destination”). Thus, independent claim 1 is submitted to be allowable over Gangitano for at least the above reasons.

Independent claims 8, 18, and 20-22 are allowable for similar reasons as set forth above in reference to independent claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9-17, and 19 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regards to the independent claims at least based on their dependency on the independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 1-2 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-22 are respectfully requested for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully request that the pending application be allowed.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Aslan Ettehadieh (Reg. No. 62,278) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: February 11, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000